‘No Touch’ Policies and the Management of Risk

Gordon Tait, QUT

Two sides of an Ethical Debate.

Side One: Children at risk

In a high-profile 1984 article in *Newsweek*, entitled ‘The Hidden Epidemic’, Russell Watson charted the meteoric rise of what is still both a very public and a very private social problem: the sexual abuse of children in the United States. During the early 1980s, it seemed as if one of society’s darkest and most private secrets was at last being exposed to the public gaze. Watson noted that the headlines were suddenly full of cases of molestation, and asked whether such sexual abuse was on the rise, or whether it was simply that people were now beginning to talk about an issue that had always been unspoken. Either way, all the evidence pointed to a social problem of enormous proportions. At this time in North America alone, some estimates ran at nearly 400,000 sexually abused children per year[1]. The research suggested that children of all ages were being abused, and that furthermore, although other forms of abuse tend to predominate among the socially disadvantaged, the sexual abuse of children is not restricted by either socio-economic status, or the education level of the perpetrator. Thus, the problem could not be publicly located within the usual, easily-demonized segments of the population. Indeed, all children could now be regarded as being ‘at-risk’.

Not surprisingly, the first line of defense in the light of these statistics was deemed to be the family. That is, by redoubling efforts to educate parents, not only in how to spot some of the symptoms of sexual abuse, but also in how to recognize dangerous situations and relationships, it was hoped that the ‘epidemic’ could be nipped in the bud. However, while still a valid strategy in its own right, this neglects probably the most salient statistic in child sexual abuse — that between 50% and 75% of all cases are incestuous, and that 90% of victims know the perpetrator[2] — arguably making some of the more popular programmes, such as ‘Stranger Danger’, quite counterproductive. Consequently, other

sites of intervention were also required, and the most obvious choice was, and still is, the school.

By the 1990s, the role of the school as the front line of detection in the war against child abuse (and in particular, child sexual abuse) had been cemented, and most new teachers are now educated about 'the abused child'. A variety of texts, such as Petrie's *Child Abuse and Neglect: Guidelines for School Personnel*[3], were now regarded as an essential part of the 'good teacher's' personal library. Such books generally provide classifications of abuse, their associated signs and symptoms, strategies for intervention, and a discussion of legal responsibilities and suggested courses of action. However, like the family, the school itself came to be publicly identified as a site of child sexual abuse. Although the figures vary markedly, there appeared to be sufficient evidence to suggest that such concerns were not unwarranted. In 1993, The American Association of University Women concluded that 25% of females, and 10% of males, between grades 8 and 11, had been sexually molested at school[4]. Other North American studies of teacher-student sexual harassment put the figures at 80% for females and 17.7% for males[5]. Figures such as these have had a profound impact, not only on the teaching profession itself, but also on other associated practices in which children are deemed vulnerable — foster care, sports coaching, child care, medical care and so on. Each of these areas, but teaching in particular, was forced to confront evidence that a significant level of child sexual abuse and harassment was occurring within its professional boundaries.

As a consequence of this, schools, and teachers themselves, had to reorganize elements of their practices when dealing with children. There were two central reasons behind these changes: first, and most obviously, the children and young people needed to be protected. Therefore, any form of intervention into educational practices that decrease the likelihood of the sexual molestation or harassment of children or youths has been regarded as desirable. This included a wide variety of new strategies and protocols: not allowing teachers to be alone with pupils, strict incident reporting procedures, pupil awareness programmes, and significantly, across-the-board 'no-touch' policies. Second, both the

schools and the teachers themselves needed to be protected. Some contend that North American educational authorities have not been fully committed to stopping sexual abuse in schools, in spite of moral and legal obligations for them to do so[6]. They argue schools exhibit a reluctance to admit that such things could possibly occur in their institution. Yet equally significantly, until recently, schools have only faced very limited liability against the sexual misconduct of their employees, but this is likely to be no longer the case. Consequently, in a climate of increasing awareness of school-based child and youth sexual assault and harassment (as well as an increasing number of accusations made against teachers), teachers have been forced into action to protect themselves. Once again, the touching of children has been a focal point:

> For the past 20 years the trend towards abstaining from touch in schools has been growing in direct response to the growth in sensitivity towards the problems of sexual harassment, molestation, and abuse. In an effort to keep one step ahead of sexual offenders, more and more schools are sending the message to adults everywhere — hands off! Compounding this situation are laws and ethical codes that interpret touching in vague and sometimes unrealistic ways. Is it any wonder that most teachers, counselors, and even parents now refrain from adding that personal touch to their interactions with children? Touching children in schools has become virtually taboo[7].

Amy Dickinson[8] in her article 'Block that Hug' summarises some of the strategies that North American teachers and sports coaches should adopt to avoid misunderstanding or the threat of false accusation. These include never touching a child, even if they are hurt, unless someone else is present. While 'hi-fives' are generally OK — once again, as long as others are present — any other form of touching is to be avoided at all cost. Her article also reminds readers that a hug can be regarded as a criminal offence. While these changes to teacher's daily conduct may seem rather draconian, the argument is that no price is too high to pay for the sexual safety of children. Thus, according to Dickenson, the 'no touch' policy in schools, along with all the other associated protocols, is

ultimately seen as a good and desirable course of action, a necessary administrative precaution against an unspeakable evil.

Side Two: 'Child panic'

While very few would contest this last statement — that child sexual abuse is abhorrent — quite a number of teachers, academics, practitioners and parents have begun to suggest that the price *is* too high, and that the losses associated with the 'no touch' policies in school greatly outweigh the gains. Their argument is generally threefold: first, we are in the midst of a moral panic over child sexual abuse. This 'child panic'[9] has distorted the public's sense of perspective over where the greatest dangers to their children lie, and what should be done about it. Certainly, child panic is by no means limited to the teacher-pupil relationship, as there is considerable literature addressing the perceived dangers of anything from fellow pupils, internet predators, child pornographers and even Satanic sexual abusers. Some research which addresses child panic reminds us that more often than not, careful empirical examination proves the threat to be, if not groundless, then certainly massively disproportionate to the initial claims. Richard Johnson, for instance, has pointed out that as few as 1% of all reported sexual abuse cases in the United States occur in school (this volume) [**additional stats from Richard**].

The second issue raised by critical educators is that the moral panic over the sexual abuse of children in schools has resulted in a climate of fear and suspicion, particularly vis-a-vis male teachers. Male teachers are currently being forced to teach differently, not for pedagogic reasons, but simply to avoid the risk of suspicion or false accusation. One outcome of this climate has been a steady decline in both the number of men contemplating teaching as a career, and the number of men who actually complete teaching qualifications having initially made the decision to teach[10]. Sarah Farquhar also notes that:

> The moral panic … is having an effect on both male and female teachers. However, research suggests that male early childhood teachers [in New Zealand] are more fearful than their female colleagues. Men working in primary schools and early

> childhood centres seem to experience greater stress and mistrust because in society sexual abuse is most often associated with male offenders[11].

Farquhar even speculates over the possibility of teaching becoming a women-only profession[12]. While not going that far, Richard Johnson notes that males, who would otherwise make excellent care-givers if not for the 'handicap' of their sex, are deciding against teaching as a profession. In *Hands Off! The disappearance of touch in the care of children*[13], he provides a wealth of evidence regarding the high levels of anxiety present in male teachers in the United States. He also discusses a third issue pertaining to the problems associated with 'no touch' policies: the loss to the children.

Johnson rightly observes that the touching of children is not, *a priori*, a bad thing — in fact, quite the reverse. He asks how it is possible to soothe and reassure very young children without the use of touch. Not only will the teacher/child relationship suffer as a consequence of the seemingly heartless adult 'standing in front of a crying first grade child … arms crossed, folded firmly against his chest'[14], but also 'hands off' simply will not work at a practical management level. Thus, the adoption of 'no touch' policies equate to a form of emotional and professional abandonment, in that physical responsiveness is a fundamental component of a caring and responsible teacher's repertoire. In summary, Richard Johnson argues that the losses associated with the 'no touch' policies far outweigh the gains. He agrees that child abuse is a significant problem, and it is desirable to do as much as possible to reduce instances of its occurrence. However, the price of continued support for 'no touch' is far too much to pay — for a range of reasons:

> Children are becoming more distrustful of adults, especially teachers; we continue to betray young children…as we submit them to a variety of inappropriate sexual abuse curricula … potential talented male caregivers are looking elsewhere for employment opportunities; Directors are likely to spend more money on liability than teacher salaries; and misinformed legislators funnel millions of dollars into

> prevention programs that could otherwise be spent on educating our young in more effective ways[15].

These two 'sides' to a discussion about child sexual abuse occur on a moral terrain. 'No touch' policies in school are either to be regarded as 'good', in that they protect the most vulnerable members of society from the sexual attention of adults, or they are 'bad', in that they have alienated pupils from their teachers, and introduced the tyranny of continual suspicion and surveillance into the modern classroom — particularly for males. My intention in the remainder of this chapter is not to take sides in the debate, but rather to briefly offer an alternative analysis, one that seeks to situate the problem not within ethics, but rather within *government*. I would point out that we should not be surprised that 'abuse' or 'panic' administrative policies have emerged surrounding the figure of the child. After all, the history of childhood has been a history of observation, intervention and regulation. 'The child' has largely acquired its current form as the result of the tactics employed in its management, and I will argue that 'no touch' is simply the latest tactic within a broad range of governmental strategies aimed at managing children — and in particular, their sexual identities and conduct.

Governance and sexuality: a brief history

The well-known French historian-philosopher Michel Foucault, in *The History of Sexuality Vol. 1*[16], effectively detailed the western obsession with sexuality, and in particular, the effect of this obsession on children. He argues this obsession has largely been grounded in sexuality's role in governance. Foucault claims that sexuality effectively straddled two important forms of social regulation — the 'anatomo-politics of the human body' and the 'bio-politics of the population'. The first of these forms centred on the body as a machine, wherein its capacities were to be maximized, its usefulness augmented, and its docility ensured. The second form addressed itself to the new raison-d'etre of government — the population. State governments sought to regulate factors such as the population's health, life expectancy, and birth rate, not merely through the legal system, but through the establishment of an effective grid of cultural norms. As sexuality is pertinent to both these domains, at the juncture of the body and the

population, it became a crucial target of a power organized around the management of daily life. In part as a consequence of this, he maintained, there occurred a rapid increase in the number of discourses on sexuality from the eighteenth century onward. As he observes: 'Surely no other type of society has ever accumulated — and in such a relatively short space of time—a similar quantity of discourses concerned with sex. It may well be that we talk about sex more than anything else'[17]… He stresses that there was no overall logic or design behind the various discourses clustered around sex at this time, but as sexual knowledge increased, there gradually emerged four strategic mechanisms of power and knowledge centred on sex. These include: a hysterization of women's bodies, a socialization of procreative behaviour, a psychiatrization of perverse pleasures and, of relevance to this chapter, a pedagogisation of children's sex:

> A pedagogisation of children's sex: a double assertion that practically all children indulge or are prone to indulge in sexual activity; and that, being unwarranted, at the same time 'natural' and 'contrary to nature', this sexual activity posed physical and moral, individual and collective dangers; children were defined as preliminary sexual beings, on this side of sex, yet within it, astride a dangerous dividing line. Parents, families, educators, doctors, and eventually psychologists would have to take charge, in a continuous way, of this precious and perilous, dangerous and endangered sexual potential[18].

While this set of concerns was most clearly evident in the war against masturbation, (which, although it was at its height between 1850 and 1880, still continued as a familiar injunction in childhood until relatively recently), such practices were not the only focus for the policing of the relationship between sex and young people — far from it. As Foucault points out, the child is 'under surveillance, surrounded in his cradle, his bed, or his room by an entire watch-crew of parents, nurses, servants, educators, and doctors, [who are] all attentive to the least manifestation of his sex'[19]… The presence of these forms of expertise permitted the authorities to realize a broad range of disciplinary schemes concerning the child, while not directly compromising the autonomy of the

family. As Nikolas Rose[20] rightly claims, childhood is the most intensely governed sector of personal existence.

Foucault and others have shown that this governance is nothing new, although its pace has accelerated markedly in the last fifty years. In his book *Centuries of Childhood*, Philippe Aries[21] argues that from the sixteenth century onward, a separate status of 'child' began to be demarcated from the broader status of adult. He argues that the idea of coddling provided the focal point around which childhood was eventually to crystallize, in that bourgeois children became a source of amusement and relaxation for their families. While this occurred within the domestic circle however, a parallel set of imperatives began to impinge upon the new space of childhood from outside the family. An assortment of churchmen and social moralists also began to take interest in childhood, but rather than lauding it for its simplicity and sweetness, they regarded the child to be in need of safeguarding and reformation. Consequently, children were no longer to be dressed and treated as miniature adults; instead they were conceived of as a form of property to be admired, cared for, disciplined, and especially, protected.

The idea that children needed to be protected formed an integral part of the relationship between childhood and sexuality — a relationship primarily based upon the notion of childhood as innocence[22]. This characterization of the child had its beginnings firmly within the rationalities associated with the bourgeois family, in that this understanding of childhood was based in the belief that children were intrinsically pure and innocent, and by shielding them from the corruption of society for as long as possible (a corruption most normally characterized by the lifestyles of the working classes), they could be equipped with the necessary moral faculties to cope by themselves later on[23]. However, within the safe bounds of the bourgeois family, the young child occupied an increasingly tenuous sexual position. Although the child was deemed to be naturally without a sexuality, the belief existed that children could potentially be sexualised, and it was not until the publication of Sigmund Freud's *Three Essays* in 1905[24] that the notion of the sexual child slowly began to become the orthodoxy. The sexualizing of childhood, of

course, brought with it its own problems. The initial separation of 'the child' from 'the adult', and the allocation of a special place for the child within the bourgeois family unit, was largely based upon a presupposition of sexual innocence. With this underpinning assumption removed, it is not surprising that child sexuality became a constant preoccupation and, thus, an obvious target for intervention, regulation and government. As seems to be consistently true of most attempts to manage the population's conduct, the history of the various attempts to regulate the sexuality of the young could generally be written in terms of their limited success:

> The mother of the middle class family had a special role, guarding her children's sexuality, but throughout the twentieth century working class families were seen to be deficient in this role. The non-respectable who left their children to raise themselves in the streets had provided the depraved with a supply of precociously sexual children, and had left middle class society, primarily through medical science, with the problem of policing the behaviour of these sexual children[25].

Despite the focus often falling upon the sexual management of children within the family, this process was also occurring within the school. Foucault illustrates how, for example, the issue of sex was central to the construction and functioning of the secondary school. Sexual preoccupation can be seen, he says, in the overall architecture of the school, in the gendered demarcation of toilets and changing rooms, and the considerable distances placed between dormitories, in the rigorous standards of behaviour and dress expected of students, to the mechanisms of punishment for transgressors, in the hierarchies of authority that policed the school itself[26]. So although sex education itself was not initially in the curriculum, the school still provided a site where desires for children's sexual management could be realized.

Most importantly, the knowledge of populations was becoming increasingly effective. Whereas once individuals had simply formed part of an unknown and unknowable mob, throughout the 19th century in Europe, they had slowly become part of a 'population', a new and pivotal phenomenon which had become the central *raison d'être* of government.

This process began with the deployment of devices such population research and the census — early versions of which enabled the sketching out of a preliminary map of some of the most important contours of community life. These contours included, for example, how many people lived in a particular country, how they were employed, where they lived, and for how long. Then, as the nineteenth century progressed, more and more statistical information was gathered about almost every conceivable aspect of existence, in what Hacking[27] referred to as 'an avalanche of printed numbers'. With this knowledge developed the notion of a population, complete with 'inherent' characteristics, features and categories, and the school became a crucial site for both the amassing of information and the intervention into conduct. After all, government had become, in the words of Gordon[28], 'the conduct of conduct'.

The increasing density of school-based governance is reflected in, for example, the number of categories of educational difference now in use. Within the realm of educational difference/handicap in Europe there were only two 'non-normal' classifications prior to 1890 (idiot and imbecile). This had swelled to eight by 1913 (including divisions such as moral imbecile, and mental defective) and on to twelve in 1945 (with severely subnormal, maladjusted, and delicate)[29]. Currently, the list of such differences is enormous — in excess of three hundred — each with its own treatment, prognosis and educational implications[30]. Sexual conduct has been governed in precisely the same way. After the first, tentative interventions into the domain of 'sexuality', it has since become the focus of expert knowledges which demarcate the boundaries between normality and abnormality. While some social norms have a long history and seem relatively stable (for example, prohibitions against homosexuality, concerns over pornography), sexual normality is now primarily counterposed against an ever-increasing raft of abnormalities:

> The list of paraphilias is long. It includes, for example, masochism and sadism, rape and lust murder, voyeurism and exhibitionism, paedophilia and gerontophilia, amputeephilia (apotemnophilia), zoophilia, klismaphilia, coprophilia, urophilia, necrophilia, fetishism, and so on[31].

These abnormalities do not remain merely as undesirable disorders. In many cases they become 'types', such as the homosexual and the paedophile, against which the normal can be contrasted. Thus sexual normality, as a domain of conduct, becomes smaller and smaller, and more and more heavily under surveillance. The school provides the most effective site for this surveillance. However, the governance of the contemporary child's sexuality does not end here. It is now also possible employ an even more effective strategy that has become woven into the fabric of the school: 'risk'. After all, not only can 'no touch' policies be regarded as simply an extension of both governance and surveillance over the sexual terrain of the child, they can also be regarded as the final word in risk management. As Sue Scott, Stevi Jackson and Kathryn Backett-Milburn (this volume) note, increasing anxiety about risk has been fused with an older set of discourses based around protectiveness. The result is a pre-occupation with prevention and constant vigilance against threats to children's well-being, and the capital example is child sexual abuse.

Enhancing the governance of sexual conduct through 'risk'

Ulrich Beck[32] argues that the characteristics of a 'wealth-distributing' society are now slowly being displaced by those of what he calls a 'risk-distributing' society. Although he concentrates primarily upon what he sees as the risky by-products of modernization — pollution, deforestation, radio-active fallout — Beck also notes that 'risk' has become central to the categorisation of people. While some risks are evenly distributed ('poverty is hierarchic, smog is democratic'), many others cluster in ways peculiar to themselves. Social risk positions arise (for example, gender and sexual assault, ethnic minority status and incarceration, and so on) and as a consequence some people are more at-risk than others of a given outcome. Needless to say, 'the child' provides one of the central focal points for this kind of analysis. Varieties of 'at-risk' children now dominate the landscape across the disciplines and departments dealing with childhood issues. The 'at-risk' child appears within law enforcement, the labour market, welfare, health, education, and family

management. Risk has become an important aspect of how we understand and manage ourselves.

This contention is supported by those such as Robert Castel[33], who argues that the shift from a focus on 'dangerous' individual (such as sexual abusers of children) to an emphasis on *categories* of person likely to put children 'at-risk', represents far more than just a semantic change. It signals an important expansion of the ways in which the population is governed, managed and regulated. Castel centres his argument around what he considers a vital shift within mental medicine, although he later extends the scope of these changes to all the care professions. He suggests that the original justification for intervention was around the notion of *dangerousness* — detecting, diagnosing, confining, and treating dangerous people. Dangerousness was thus viewed as a quality inherent to a given individual who was deemed capable of dangerous actions. However, inherent dangerousness has a crucial problem associated with it, in that it limits effective prevention. Not only is the 'inherently dangerous person' such as the paedophile difficult to rehabilitate by definition, but also :

> One could only hope to prevent violent acts committed by those whom one had already diagnosed as dangerous. Hence the double limitation arising from the fallibility of such diagnoses on the one hand, and the fact that they can only be carried out on individual patients one by one, on the other. This was why classical psychiatry was only able to make use of the correspondingly crude preventative technologies of confinement and sterilization[34].

And so, any system based upon the *inherency* of danger would always leave the profession vulnerable to criticisms over its potential inability to predict who is a dangerous person. Psychiatrists could not possibly hope to diagnose accurately and effectively neutralize dangerousness in every single case — short of confining massive numbers of people on the smallest suspicion of danger. Furthermore, 'Harmless today, they may be dangerous tomorrow'[35]. Even in the mid-nineteenth century, psychiatrists such as Morel (who first employed the term *degeneracy*) were well aware of the problems associated with treating dangerousness as an internal quality. Morel suggested,

instead, that the focus should fall upon an analysis of the statistical frequency of mental illnesses within specific strata of society. These mental illnesses could then be correlated to particular social circumstances, such as diet, housing, family circumstances, sexual promiscuity, and so on.

Dangerous teachers

The connection to the central issue of this chapter is obvious. It is almost impossible to try and detect in advance a 'dangerous' teacher, a teacher who will, at some point, molest one of their children. It is far more effective (according to this new strategy) to isolate an entire category of person — in this case, male teachers — and treat them as a 'high-risk' grouping. Having made this categorisation, it then logically follows that it is appropriate to put in place a series of preventative programs (ie. 'no touch') in an attempt to ameliorate the problem, and so reduce the risk. Of course, this may in turn produce an array of other 'risk' groupings: 'male teachers at risk of leaving the profession', 'children at risk of fearing all physical contact', 'boys at risk of having no gentle male role models' and 'schools at-risk of witch-hunts', but these can be dealt with separately by their own governmental programmes.

Two other associated points are of note here. First, 'risk' legitimates increased intervention into the capacities, conduct and aspirations of the population. Thus, Castel contends, the deployment of risk permits virtually limitless possibilities of regulation, based upon unlimited suspicion. Indeed,

> 'Prevention' in effect promotes suspicion to the dignified scientific rank of a calculus of probability. To be suspected, it is no longer necessary to manifest symptoms of dangerousness or abnormality, it is enough to display whatever characteristics the specialists responsible for the definition of preventative policy have constituted as risk factors[36].

Castel contends that the reach of risk is endless. After all, as Ewald states: 'anything *can* be a risk; it all depends upon how one analyses the danger, considers the event'[37]. Nothing remains outside its territory; hence, nothing remains beyond potential

intervention. Because risk can be legitimately found anywhere, there is no one who is not at some risk of something … or at-risk of putting someone else at-risk, as even female teachers are not above suspicion in the war on child sexual abuse in schools.

The second point is that the shift from the emphasis from dangerousness to risk has exponentially broadened the likelihood of the detection of child sexual abuse, or at least has exponentially raised its profile as an issue of concern. It is no longer only doctors, psychiatrists or legal professionals who are capable of credibly voicing their diagnoses and pointing their finger at the guilty. Risk has democratized the entire process. Parents and neighbours are now encouraged to look for the presence of any number of risk factors within the confines of the family, within a broad array of sexual, educational, narcotic, legal, moral and medical concerns. Likewise teachers are now expected to be aware of any number of 'risk factors' pertinent to particular at-risk groups, for anything from teen pregnancy and drug abuse to illiteracy and truancy. More importantly, those who supervise the teachers will know the power of 'risk'. The principals of kindergartens, crèches, primary and secondary schools, will all know their own institution's risk exposure, which will include a huge range of specific risk groupings, risk factors, and risk activities. It appears as if touching children now fits into this final category.

Conclusion

I have tried to avoid joining directly into the ethical debate over 'no touch' policies in schools. Both sides present convincing cases. Child sexual abuse occupies a place of abhorrence in contemporary society, and it is easy to argue that any programmes that reduce its incidence are worth the time and effort. Also, schools appear to be a place where such abuse can occur, so educators and others are obviously duty-bound to do all they feasibly can make them safer. However, as others point out, school-based child sexual abuse represents only a tiny percentage of the total, and so 'no touch' policies are a wild over-reaction to what is essentially a moral panic of epic proportions. Removing the possibility of touch between teacher and pupil, especially for young children, is far too high a price to pay for the benefits it is purported to provide.

Having laid out the terrain of the debate, I went on to address 'no touch', not from an ethical standpoint, but from a historical and a governmental one. Given the increasingly complex web of knowledge that has been woven into our society over the past two hundred years, it should not come as any great surprise that regimes of surveillance and regulation have been implemented. This is particularly the case given the issues involved. As I mentioned, not only is childhood the most densely governed sector of personal existence, characterised by discourses of innocence and vulnerability, but sex and sexuality probably constitutes the main preoccupation within contemporary culture. Add to this the widespread utilisation of devices such as 'risk', that no longer even requires an act of crime for intervention to be initiated, then the question becomes not whether 'no-touch' is a good or a bad policy, but rather, given the almost exponential increase in such mechanisms of personal and social governance, what forms of teacher-pupil interaction will be subject to intervention next.

References

[1] National Centre on Child Abuse and Neglect, (1983).

[2] D. Finklehor, (1979) *Sexually Victimised Children* (The Free Press: New York, 1979);

J. James & J. Meyerding 'Early Sexual Experiences as a Factor in Prostitution', *American Journal of Psychiatry* 134 (1977), pp. 1381-1385.

[3] S. Petrie *Child Abuse and Neglect: Guidelines for School Personnel* (BCAE: Kelvin Grove, 1986).

[4] Cited in R. Fossey & T. Demitchell ''Let the Master Answer': Holding Schools Vicariously Liable When Employees Sexually Abuse Children', *Journal of Law and Education* 25/4 (1996), pp. 575-599.

[5] D. Wishnietsky 'Reported and Unreported Teacher-Student Sexual Harassment', *Journal of Educational Research* 3 (1991), pp. 164-169.

[6] Fossey and Demitchell (1996), p. 575.

[7] T. Del Prete 'Hands Off? The Touchy Subject of Touching' *The Education Digest* 62/7 (1977), p. 59.

[8] A. Dickinson 'Block That Hug', *Time* 155/14 (2000), p. 142.

[9] J. Wallace 'Technologies of the "Child": Towards a Theory of the Child-subject', *Textual Practice* 9/2 (1997), pp. 285-302.

[10] E. McWilliam, G. Tait, & T. Morgan *Men and Teaching: a Pilot Study into Male Attrition from Pre-service Teacher Education Courses.* Unpublished Paper. (Faculty of Education: QUT, 1999).

[11] S. Farquhar *The Disappearance of Caring in New Zealand Education.* Paper presented at Hands Off?: Teachers Touching Children Conference (Auckland, November 1999), p. 1.

[12] S. Farquhar 'Teaching: A Women Only Profession?' *New Zealand Annual Review of Education* 15/3 (1997), pp. 243-252.

[13] R. Johnson *Hands Off: the disappearance of touch in the care of children* (New York: Peter Lang, 2000).

[14] Ibid (2000), p. 74.

[15] R. Johnson *Of Containment, Risk Management and Dangerous Desire: (Re)writing the Body in an Era of 'No Touch'*. Paper presented at Hands Off?: Teachers Touching Children Conference (Auckland, November, 1999), p. 2.

[16] M. Foucault *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1976).

[17] Ibid (1976), p. 33.

[18] Ibid (1976), p. 104.

[19] Ibid (1976), p. 98.

[20] Nikolas Rose *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self* (London: Routledge, 1990).

[21] P. Aries *Centuries of Childhood* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1960).

[22] L. Finch *The Classing Gaze: Sexuality, Class and Surveillance* (Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1993), p. 70.

[23] J. Weeks *Sex, Politics and Society: The Regulation of Sexuality Since 1880* (London: Longman, 1981), p. 49.

[24] Sigmund Freud *Three Essays on Sexuality* (1905).

[25] L. Finch (1993), p. 85.

[26] See Middleton for an account of these arguments in a New Zealand context.

[27] I. Hacking 'Bio-power and the Avalanche of Printed Numbers', *Humanities in Society* 5 (1982), pp. 279-295.

[28] C. Gordon 'Governmental Rationality: An Introduction', in G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller (eds.) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991), p. 2.

[29] S. Tomlinson *A Sociology of Special Education* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982).

[30] P. Whitefield, 'Disordered Behaviour and Fuzzy Categories', *Education Links* 59 (1999), pp. 22-25.

[31] B. Wolfman & J. Money *Handbook of Human Sexuality* (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1980), p. 272.

[32] U. Beck *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity* (London: Sage, 1992).

[33] R. Castel 'From Dangerousness to Risk'. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller (eds.) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (London: Harvester /Wheatsheaf, 1991).

[34] Ibid (1991), p. 283.

[35] Ibid (1991), p. 283.

[36] Ibid (1991), p. 288.

[37] F. Ewald 'Insurance and Risk'. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller (eds.) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (London: Harvester/Wheatsheaf, 1991), p. 199.